



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,797	12/03/2001	Jeffrey Scott Weaver	10010092-1	7072

7590 10/06/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

LAM, ANDREW H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/998,797

Applicant(s)

WEAVER, JEFFREY SCOTT

Examiner

Andrew H. Lam

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-20, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-20, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: an Amendment filed on 8/05/05.
- Claims 1-6, 8-20, 22 and 23 are pending in the present application. Claims 7 and 21 are canceled. Claims 1, 6, 13, 17, 18 and 20 are amended. New claims 22 and 23 are added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 17, 18, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazzagatte et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,862,583) hereinafter Mazzagatte in view of Lupien, Jr. et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,530) hereinafter Lupien.

Regarding claim 1, Mazzagatte discloses a method for providing documents to an authorized user, said method comprising: receiving, via a computer network (fig. 1, network 100 connected to clients 10 and 20 with printers 30 and 57), information to be printed and first information corresponding to a user (col. 8, lines 19, sender submits print job with unique identification information); receiving second information corresponding to a user (col. 9, lines 32-34, the intended recipient then arrived at the printer and present the proper authentication information in order to process the print job); comparing the first information to the second information (col. 9, lines 56-61, the

Art Unit: 2624

intended recipient is "challenge/response" to verify the integrity of the unique identification information) ; and such that printing of the information to be printed is performed if the second information corresponds to the first information (col. 9, lines 61-62, once the recipient is authenticated, the printer then proceeds with the printout process--that is if the second information matches with the first information).

Mazzagatte does not disclose expressly that the receipt of the second information should not be interrupted during printing. If the receipt of the second information is interrupted during printing the printer will discontinue printing.

Lupien discloses a security system for printers and multifunction devices that use a continuous authorization signal and monitoring of a received indication from a RFID tag to verify the identity of the user, and to ensure continuing operation of the printer. The printer cannot be made to operate without the tag being in the range of the printer (col. 3, line 57). The flow chart in fig. 2 shows that the user must always have the tag transmit a valid signal to the printer or else the program within the printer will loop back to step 208, which is to listen for response from a signal. Also, after the id is check in step 212 with a valid verification the program within the printer loop back to step 202 and cycle through the program to verify that the signal is not interrupted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Mazzagatte as per teaching of Lupien for the following reasons: (1) by having a system that continuously checks for a valid continuous signal added security in the system is provided because the printer system verifies that the user is currently present at the printer during printing. (2) Continuous operation of the

printer is assured.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Mazzagatte and Lupien discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising [in Mazzagatte]: providing a printing device (fig. 1, image forming device 50); and wherein receiving second information corresponding to a user comprises: receiving the second information from the user at the printing device (col. 9, lines 42-44, the intended recipient presents authentication information to the printer).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Mazzagatte and Lupien discloses the method of claim 2, further comprising [in Mazzagatte]: providing an identification device configured to transmit the second information (col. 9, lines 50-51, the user transmit the unique identification information in digital form to the printer, i.e. smart-card); and wherein receiving the second information is enabled when the identification device is in a proximity of the printing device (col. 9, lines 50-55, the intended recipient insert the smart-card containing unique identification information into the smart-card reader).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Mazzagatte and Lupien discloses the method of claim 2, further comprising: discontinuing printing of the information to be printed if the second information is not being received continuously at the printing device (Lupien, col. 3, line 57, the printer can not be made to operate without the RFID tag constantly presented to the printer, see fig. 3).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Mazzagatte and Lupien discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising [in Mazzagatte]: storing the information to be printed and the first information at a time after receipt (col. 9, lines 8-10, once the printer receive the

Art Unit: 2624

print data and the digital certificate the information is stored, i.e. is stored in print queue); and erasing the information to be printed at a time after printing (col. 10, lines 15-20, the intended recipient uses the smart-card to authenticate himself, once authenticated the job is printed from the print queue--it is known in the art that a print queue is a lineup of items waiting to be printed and that the job will be removed from the queue once it is processed).

Regarding claim 17, Mazzagatte discloses a print system (fig. 1, printing system) comprising: a print authorization system (fig. 1, smart card reader 35) configured to: receive, via a computer network (fig. 1, network 100), information to be printed and first information corresponding to a user (col. 8, lines 19, sender submits print job with unique identification information); receive second information corresponding to a user (col. 9, lines 32-34, the intended recipient then arrived at the printer and present the proper authentication information in order to process the print job); compare the first information to the second information (col. 9, lines 56-61, the intended recipient is "challenge/response" to verify the integrity of the unique identification information); and enable printing of the information to be printed if the second information corresponds to the first information (col. 9, lines 61-62, once the recipient is authenticated, the printer then proceeds with the printout process).

Mazzagatte does not disclose expressly that the receipt of the second information should not be interrupted during printing. If the receipt of the second information is interrupted during printing the printer will discontinue printing.

Lupien discloses a security system for printers and multifunction devices that use a continuous authorization signal and monitoring of a received indication from a RFID tag to verify the identity of the user, and to ensure continuing operation of the printer. The printer cannot be made to operate without the tag being in the range of the printer (col. 3, line 57). The flow chart in fig. 2 shows that the user must always have the tag transmit a valid signal to the printer or else the program within the printer will loop back to step 208, which is to listen for response from a signal. Also, after the id is check in step 212 with a valid verification the program within the printer loop back to step 202 and cycle through the program to verify that the signal is not interrupted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Mazzagatte as per teaching of Lupien for the following reasons: (1) by having a system that continuously checks for a valid continuous signal added security in the system is provided because the printer system verifies that the user is currently present at the printer during printing. (2) Continuous operation of the printer is assured.

Regarding claim 18, the combination of Mazzagatte and Lupien discloses the method of claim 17 [in Mazzagatte], wherein the print authorization system is further configured to determine whether the second information is being received continuously and discontinue printing of the information to be printed if the second information is not being received continuously (Lupien, col. 3, line 57, the printer can not be made to operate without the RFID tag constantly presented to the printer, see fig. 3).

Regarding claim 20, Mazzagatte discloses a computer readable medium (col. 5, lines 11-13, fixed disk 280 is an example of a computer readable medium that stores program instruction sequences executable by a CPU, see fig. 2) comprising: logic configured (fig. 3, control logic 320) to receive information to be printed and first information corresponding to a user (col. 8, lines 19, sender submits print job with unique identification information); logic configured (fig. 3, smartcard interface 365) to receive second information corresponding to a user (col. 9, lines 32-34, the intended recipient then arrived at the printer and present the proper authentication information in order to process the print job); logic configured (fig. 3, printer memory 51) to compare the first information to the second information (col. 9, lines 56-61, the intended recipient is "challenge/response" to verify the integrity of the unique identification information); and logic configured (fig. 3, printer memory 51) to enable printing of the information to be printed if the second information corresponds to the first information (col. 9, lines 61-62, once the recipient is authenticated, the printer then proceeds with the printout process).

Mazzagatte does not disclose expressly that the receipt of the second information should not be interrupted during printing. If the receipt of the second information is interrupted during printing the printer will discontinue printing.

Lupien discloses a security system for printers and multifunction devices that use a continuous authorization signal and monitoring of a received indication from a RFID tag to verify the identity of the user, and to ensure continuing operation of the printer. The printer cannot be made to operate without the tag being in the range of the printer

(col. 3, line 57). The flow chart in fig. 2 shows that the user must always have the tag transmit a valid signal to the printer or else the program within the printer will loop back to step 208, which is to listen for response from a signal. Also, after the id is check in step 212 with a valid verification the program within the printer loop back to step 202 and cycle through the program to verify that the signal is not interrupted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Mazzagatte as per teaching of Lupien for the following reasons: (1) by having a system that continuously checks for a valid continuous signal added security in the system is provided because the printer system verifies that the user is currently present at the printer during printing. (2) Continuous operation of the printer is assured.

Regarding claim 22, the combination of Mazzagatte and Lupien discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising [in Lupien]: continuing printing of the information to be printed responsive to receiving the second information, after discontinuing such printing in response to receipt of the second information being interrupted (fig. 2, illustrate a flow chart that constantly check for a continuous id from the user. Since the system is design to continuously listen for a response from a valid user the user can present the id again and continue with using the printer feature (col. 4, line 60)).

Claims 4, 5, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazzagatte and Lupien in view of Herbert (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,505).

Regarding claim 4 which depends on claim 2, the combination [Mazzagatte and

Lupien] discloses a method for providing documents to an authorized user, said method comprising: receiving, via a computer network (fig. 1, network 100 connected to clients 10 and 20 with printers 30 and 57), information to be printed and first information corresponding to a user (col. 8, lines 19, sender submits print job with unique identification information); receiving second information corresponding to a user (col. 9, lines 32-34, the intended recipient then arrived at the printer and present the proper authentication information in order to process the print job); comparing the first information to the second information (col. 9, lines 56-61, the intended recipient is "challenge/response" to verify the integrity of the unique identification information) ; and enabling printing of the information to be printed if the second information corresponds to the first information (col. 9, lines 61-62, once the recipient is authenticated, the printer then proceeds with the printout process).

The combination does not disclose expressly a method for storing third information; providing a print cartridge configured to transmit fourth information, said print cartridge being installed in the printing device and containing ink for printing; comparing the third information to the fourth information; and enabling printing of the information to be printed if the fourth information corresponds to the third information.

Herbert discloses a method for using a smart device on the cartridge to communicate with a sensor port connected to the microprocessor. The microprocessor reads data recorded in the smart device and if the unique identity of the print head module read from the smart device is recognized by the microprocessor of the postage meter, the microprocessor continues with the postage printing (col.4, lines 9-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination as per teaching of Herbert because of the following reason: by using a smart device embedded on the ink cartridge measures are taken to ensure that only authorized print cartridge are used to connect to the printing device (col. 3, lines 62-67). Thus, achieving the objective of Mazzagatte and Lupien, which is to authenticate secure printing of document for the intended recipient.

Regarding claim 5, which depends from claim 4, the combination further teaches [in Herbert]: wherein storing the third information and comparing the third information to the fourth information is performed at the printing device (the microprocessor reads data recorded in the smart device and if the unique identity of the print head module read from the smart device is recognized by the microprocessor of the postage meter, the microprocessor continues with the postage printing (col.4, lines 9-14).

Regarding claim 19, which depends from claim 17, the combination [Mazzagatte and Lupien] discloses a printing authorization system configured to: receive, via a computer network, information to be printed and first information corresponding to a user; receiving second information corresponding to a user; compare the first information with the second information and if the two information matches allow printing of the job in the queue for the user, unless the second information is interrupted during printing the printing process is discontinued.

The combination does not disclose expressly that the first information is embedded on an ink cartridge having a readable identification tag for providing first information.

Herbert discloses a printing device for using a smart device on the cartridge to communicate with a sensor port connected to the microprocessor. The microprocessor reads data recorded in the smart device and if the unique identity of the print head module read from the smart device is recognized by the microprocessor of the postage meter, the microprocessor continues with the postage printing (col.4, lines 9-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination as per teaching of Herbert because of the following reason: by using a smart device embedded on the ink cartridge measures are taken to ensure that only authorized print cartridge are used to connect to the printing device (col. 3, lines 62-67). Thus, achieving the objective of Mazzagatte, which is to authenticate secure printing of document for the intended recipient.

Regarding claim 23, the combination [Mazzagatte and Herbert] discloses the system of claim 9, a printing system comprising: a printing device having a first print cartridge and an identification reader; receiving via a communication network, information to be printed with second information corresponding to a user; and receiving third information corresponding to user via the identification reader such that, if the third information correspond to the second information enables the printing device to print the print job queue for the user.

The combination does not disclose expressly that the receipt of the third information should not be interrupted during printing. If the receipt of the third information is interrupted during printing the printer will discontinue printing.

Lupien discloses a security system for printers and multifunction devices that use a continuous authorization signal and monitoring of a received indication from a RFID tag to verify the identity of the user, and to ensure continuing operation of the printer. The printer cannot be made to operate without the tag being in the range of the printer (col. 3, line 57). The flow chart in fig. 2 shows that the user must always have the tag transmit a valid signal to the printer or else the program within the printer will loop back to step 208, which is to listen for response from a signal. Also, after the id is check in step 212 with a valid verification the program within the printer loop back to step 202 and cycle through the program to verify that the signal is not interrupted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Mazzagatte as per teaching of Lupien for the following reasons: (1) by having a system that continuously checks for a valid continuous signal added security in the system is provided because the printer system verifies that the user is currently present at the printer during printing. (2) Continuous operation of the printer is assured.

Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazzagatte in view of Herbet.

Regarding claim 9, Mazzagatte discloses print system (fig. 1, printing system) comprising: providing documents to an authorized user, said apparatus comprising: receiving, via a computer network (fig. 1, network 100 connected to clients 10 and 20 with printers 30 and 57), information to be printed and first information corresponding to a user (col. 8, lines 19, sender submits print job with unique identification information);

Art Unit: 2624

receiving second information corresponding to a user (col. 9, lines 32-34, the intended recipient then arrived at the printer and present the proper authentication information in order to process the print job); comparing the first information to the second information (col. 9, lines 56-61, the intended recipient is "challenge/response" to verify the integrity of the unique identification information) ; and enabling printing of the information to be printed if the second information corresponds to the first information (col. 9, lines 61-62, once the recipient is authenticated, the printer then proceeds with the printout process).

Mazzagatte does not disclose expressly a printing device having a first print cartridge and an identification reader, the first print cartridge containing a print substance for printing on a print medium, the first cartridge having a transmitter readable identification tag for providing first information, the identification reader being configured to receive the first information from the identification tag, such that, if the first information corresponds to the printing device, the identification reader enables the printing device to print

Herbert discloses a printing device for using a smart device on the cartridge to communicate with a sensor port connected to the microprocessor. The microprocessor reads data recorded in the smart device and if the unique identity of the print head module read from the smart device is recognized by the microprocessor of the postage meter, the microprocessor continues with the postage printing (col.4, lines 9-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Mazzagatte as per teaching of Herbert because of the following reason: by using a smart device embedded on the ink cartridge measures are

taken to ensure that only authorized print cartridge are used to connect to the printing device (col. 3, lines 62-67). Thus, achieving the objective of Mazzagatte, which is to authenticate secure printing of document for the intended recipient.

Regarding claim 10, which depends from claim 9, the combination further teaches [in Mazzagatte] wherein the identification reader includes a receiver (col. 8, line 34, smart card reader 15, see fig. 1), the receiver being adapted to receive the first and third information via wireless communication (col. 9, line 52, insert smart card into smart card reader).

Regarding claim 11, which depends from claim 9, the combination further teaches [in Mazzagatte], wherein the identification reader includes means for receiving information via wireless communication (col. 9, line 52, insert smart card into smart card reader).

Regarding claim 12, which depends from claim 9, the combination further teaches [in Mazzagatte], further comprising: user identification tag adapted to communicate with the identification reader via wireless communication (col. 9, line 52, insert smart card into smart card reader), the identification tag including a memory (inherently smart card holds some sort of identification number therefore it has memory), the memory storing data corresponding to the third information (col 8, lines 35-37, the smart card contain the recipient's unique identification information in digital form), the user identification tag being adapted to provide the third information to the identification reader (col. 9, line 52, insert smart card into smart card reader).

Regarding claim 13, which depends from claim 9, the combination further

Art Unit: 2624

teaches [in Herbert], further comprising: a second print cartridge having an identification reader, the second print cartridge containing a print substance for printing on a print medium and a readable identification tag for providing the first information, the second print cartridge being adapted to be installed in the printing device after the first print cartridge is removed from the printing device (col. 3, lines 62-67, the first cartridge is removed and a new print cartridge (second print cartridge) is installed, col. 4, lines 9-14 the microprocessor reads data recorded in the smart device and if the unique identity of the print head module read from the smart device is recognized by the microprocessor of the postage meter, the microprocessor continues with the postage printing).

Regarding claim 14, which depends from claim 9, the combination further teaches [in Mazzagatte], wherein the print authorization system is a print-end print authorization system implemented by the printing device (fig. 1, smart card read 15 is attached to pc 15); and further comprising: a user-end print authorization system adapted to communicate with the printing device (col. 4, lines 23-25, smart card reader 35 is interface with copier 30, see fig 1), the user-end print authorization system being configured to enable a user to provide the second information to the print-end print authorization system via a communication network (fig. 1, network 100, interface communication between the user pc 10 and the printer 30).

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 9, the combination further teaches [in Mazzagatte], wherein the user-end print authorization system is adapted to provide a user interface (fig. 2, display interface 250), the user interface enabling a user to designate information to be printed and select a secure-enable mode (col. 7, line 57-

Art Unit: 2624

58, one can select secure or non-secure transmission mode) such that, when the user selects the secure-enable mode, the information to be printed can only be printed by the printing device while the identification reader receives the third information (col. 9, lines 32-35, the print job is held in the print queue and can not be process further until the recipient present the proper authentication information in order to retrieve the print job and have it printed).

Regarding claim 16, which depends from claim 9, the combination further teaches [in Mazzagatte], wherein the printing device includes memory (fig. 3, printer memory 51), the printing device being configured to store the information to be printed (fig. 3, queue 356 to store print job) and the first information in the memory at a time after receipt (col. 8, lines 19, sender submits print job with unique identification information), the printing device being further configured to render the information to be printed inaccessible from the memory at a time after printing (col. 10, lines 15-20, the intended recipient uses the smart-card to authenticate himself, once authenticated the job is printed from the print queue--it is known in the art that a print queue is a lineup of items waiting to be printed and that the job will be removed from the queue once it is processed).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 10-13, filed 08/05/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 17, 20 and 21 under 102(e) and 4, and 5 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is

Art Unit: 2624

made in view of newly found prior art references due to newly amended limitations as cited in claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 19, 20 and 21.

Regarding claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 19, 20 and 21, the applicant argued the cited prior art (U.S. Patent No. 6,862,583 to Mazzagatte) fail to teach and or/ suggest that "unless receipt of second information is interrupted during printing of the information to be printed, thereby discontinuing the printing".

In response to applicant's argument Lupien discloses a security system for printers and multifunction devices that use a continuous authorization signal and monitoring for received indication from a RFID tag to verify the identity of the user and it ensure continuing operation of the printer. The printer cannot be made to operate without the tag being in the range of the printer (col. 3, line 57). The flow chart in fig. 2 shows that the user must always have the tag transmit a valid signal to the printer or else it will loop back to step 208, which is to listen for response from a signal. Also, after the id is check in step 212 with a valid verification the process loop back to step 202 and cycle through the process to verify that the signal is not interrupted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Mazzagatte as per teaching of Lupien for the following reasons: (1) by having a system that continuously checks for a valid continuous signal of the printer is assured added security in the system as provided because the printer system verifies that the user is currently present at the printer during printing. (2) Continuous operation.

Regarding claims 9-16, the applicant has argued that there is not motivation to combine because "Herbert is not involved in any manner with preventing unauthorized access to printed documents. Second, the teaching of Herbert does not achieve the objective of Mazzagatte, because the teachings of Herbert could prevent any users from being able to print documents, not just unauthorized user".

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Herbert teaches that in order to use the printing device the print cartridge must be recognized by the printing device in order for the printing device to work, which is the same limitation as in claim 9 "first information from the identification tag, such that, if the first information corresponds to the printing device, the identification reader enables the printing device to print". As a result, if the cartridge is recognized by the printing device the microprocessor would enable the printing device to print for authorize user once authentication is verified as per teaching of Mazzagatte.

Contact Information

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew H. Lam whose telephone number is (571) 272-8569. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600